

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11 and 13-16 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 10 and 16 are amended. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Callaway in the November 20 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1, 6 and 16 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

**I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-5 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,806,982 to Newswanger et al. (hereinafter "Newswanger") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0013959 to Long (hereinafter "Long"); and claims 6-8, 10, 11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Newswanger in view of Long and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0117615 to Mui (hereinafter "Mui"). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the Response to Arguments Section of the August 21 Office Action, the Office Action alleges that the feature reciting, "so that the object beam in the object optical system is reflected in an exposure direction so as to be incident on the holographic medium or in a non-exposure direction so as not to be incident on the holographic recording medium" is disclosed in Newswanger because Newswanger discloses one of the two recited limitations, specifically, reflecting an object beam in an exposure direction. The Office Action alleges that Newswanger's SLM is the component that reflects the object beam in an exposure direction.

However, Newswanger fails to disclose or render obvious controlling an object optical system between an exposure direction and a non-exposure direction. Instead, Newswanger's

reflective SLM rotates the polarization state of the object beam. (See Newswanger's col. 13, lines 29-31). Since Newswanger's SLM is reflective, the object beam is always reflected in an exposure direction.

In addition, Long and Mui fail to cure the deficiencies of Newswanger with respect to the recited feature. Long discloses using an LCD to create a diffraction array which causes various areas in the incident laser beam 57 to diffract into one or more diffracted beams. (See Long's paragraph [0052]). Mui discloses a similar reflective SLM to the SLM disclosed in Newswanger where the object beam is always reflected by the SLM in an exposure direction. (See Mui's paragraph [0029]).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection be withdrawn.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Michael S. Ryan  
Registration No. 63,115

JAO:MSR/jth

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: December 9, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--